

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

| | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| GEORGE IVAN LOPEZ, <i>et al.</i>, | : | CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:21-CV-1819 |
| | : | |
| Plaintiffs | : | (Judge Conner) |
| | : | |
| v. | : | |
| | : | |
| JOHN E. WETZEL, <i>et al.</i>, | : | |
| | : | |
| Defendants | : | |

ORDER

AND NOW, this 22nd day of November, 2022, upon consideration of plaintiffs’ joint motion (Doc. 84) for leave to respond to defendants’ notice (Doc. 82) of supplemental authority, to which plaintiffs attached a one-page response (see Doc. 84-1) contending that defendants’ notice should be stricken for noncompliance with Rule 7.36 of the Local Rules of Court, which provides, *inter alia*, that a “party may file a notice of supplemental authority,” not exceeding 100 words, “setting forth [] supplemental citations” to “pertinent and significant cases [that] are decided . . . *after* the party’s final brief has been filed,” see M.D. PA. L.R. 7.36 (emphasis added), and the court observing that the supplemental authority proffered by defendants, Williams v. Wetzel, No. 2:21-CV-1248, 2022 WL 2869316 (E.D. Pa. July 21, 2022), was decided *before* the briefing schedule for objections to the pending report and recommendation (Doc. 53) commenced, and is contained in a notice whose word count is more than twice the permissible limit, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiffs’ joint motion (Doc. 84) for leave to respond is GRANTED. We will consider plaintiffs’ response (Doc. 84-1), which we construe as a motion to strike defendants’ notice (Doc. 82) of supplemental authority.

2. Defendants shall file a response on or before **Friday, December 2, 2022**, showing cause why their notice (Doc. 82) of supplemental authority should not be stricken for noncompliance with Rule 7.36.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
Christopher C. Conner
United States District Judge
Middle District of Pennsylvania